

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19, 20, and 22-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 19, 20, and 22 and CANCELS claims 3, 18, and 21. Claims 5-7 and 12 stand withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as being directed to non-elected species.

Applicant notes that the Examiner indicated in the Office Action that only claims 1-4, 8-11, and 13-25 are pending in this application. Applicant respectfully submits that although claims 5-7 and 12 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as being directed to non-elected species, claims 5-7 and 12 are still pending in this application. Since claims 5-7 are dependent upon generic claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin and allow non-elected claims 5-7 when generic claim 1 is allowed. Furthermore, since claim 12 has been amended to include all of the features recited in allowable claim 3, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin and allow non-elected claim 12.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 3, 9, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant notes, however, that claim 13 is already in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13 and 14, which depends from claim 13, are in condition for allowance. Applicant notes that claim 15 was also rejected over prior art, and therefore it appears that the Examiner incorrectly indicated claim 15 as being allowable

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 16, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Homuth (U.S. 2,715,842). Claims 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homuth in view of Oetting et al. (U.S. 4,499,965). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homuth in view of Oetting et al. (U.S. 4,499,965).

Applicant has canceled claims 3, 18, and 21 and amended each of claims 1, 8, 12, 16, 20, and 23 to include all of the features recited in allowable claim 3.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1, 8, 16,

and under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Homuth, and the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homuth in view of Oetting et al. are moot.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 8, 12, 16, 20, and 23 are allowable. Claims 2, 4, 9-11, 17, 19, 22, 24, and 25 depend upon claims 1, 8, 16, 20, and 23, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1, 8, 16, 20, and 23 are allowable. As indicated above, claims 13 and 14 are also allowable.

In view of the allowability of generic claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that non-elected claims 5-7 be rejoined and also allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 23, 2010

/Stephen R. Funk #57,751/
Attorneys for Applicant

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200
Reston, VA 20191
Telephone: (571) 313-7440
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368
Stephen R. Funk
Registration No. 57,751